

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lan et al. in view of Yamaguchi et al., and further in view of Usagawa et al.

The statement made in the Office Action at the end of page 3, that Lan et al. discloses using an epoxy material for the insulating layer and Yamaguchi et al. discloses using an epoxy based resin for the resin film, and, thus, the Lan et al. can be modified by use of the teachings of Yamaguchi et al., which disclose the following limitation "the insulating layer . . . of the same material as the resin film."

It is respectfully suggested that this assertion is unsupported since there is no motivation to use the insulating layer formed of an epoxy material as disclosed in the Lan et al. reference with the resin film formed of an epoxy based resin as disclosed in the Yamaguchi et al. reference. Additionally, even if one combines the Lan et al. reference and the Yamaguchi et al. reference, the result would be usage of an epoxy material for the insulating layer and an epoxy based material for the resin film, that is, the insulating layer and the resin film are formed of not completely of the same material but of the same kind or type of material.

In response to the assertion of absence from the claims of the limitations last argued as distinguishing Lan et al., i.e., that the metal column is manufactured by metal-plating, Applicants have inserted such limitation in independent Claims 1 and 11. Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 37, line 32 – page 38, line 11 of the originally filed specification. No new matter is added.

Moreover, recitation added to Claims 1 and 11 of this previously considered limitation does not present grounds for new consideration and/or search, since as set forth in the Applicant's response to the Response to Arguments section, page 8, full consideration of this distinguishing feature was had in response to the previous Office Action. Entry of the above-recited amendments is respectfully requested for purposes of advancing prosecution of this application.

For the above reasons, it is considered that the claims, as amended, find support in the application specification as filed, and that the combination of elements recited in the pending claims, as amended, distinguish over the references of record. Accordingly, an indication of allowable subject matter is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



December 18, 2003

Vangelis Economou -Reg. No. 32,341  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue - Suite 1200  
Chicago Illinois 60604  
Tel. No. (312) 427-1300